,	DEFORE THE READ AT E	RECEIVE RECEIVE COMMISSIA FOR FOR	iá Ection	
1 2	BEFORE THE FEDERAL E	BEFORE THE FEDERAL ELECTION COMMISSION COMMISSION		
3)	u o ár	
4	i j) 2014 OCT 22 A	iff 9: 34	
5) DISMISSAL AND	•	
6) CASE CLOSURE UNDER LINE (
7	•) ENFORCEMENT PRIORITY SYS	STEM	
8	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·)		
9)		
10 11)		
12	GENERAL COUNSEL'S REPORT			
13 14	Under the Enforcement Priority System, the Commission uses formal scoring criteria as a			
	Onder the Distriction of Horizon and Commission about tornian bearing and			
15	basis to allocate its resources and decide which matters to pursue. These criteria include, without			
16	limitation, an assessment of the following factors: (1) the gravity of the alleged violation, taking			
17	into account both the type of activity and the amount in violation; (2) the apparent impact the			
18	alleged violation may have had on the electoral process; (3) the complexity of the legal issues raised			
19	in the matter; and (4) recent trends in potential violations of the Federal Election Campaign Act of			
20	1971, as amended (the "Act"), and developments of the law. It is the Commission's policy that			
21	pursuing relatively low-rated matters on the Enforce	pursuing relatively low-rated matters on the Enforcement docket warrants the exercise of its		
22	2 prosecutorial discretion to dismiss cases under cert	prosecutorial discretion to dismiss cases under certain circumstances. The Office of General		
23	3 Counsel has determined that MU	UR 6754 should not be referred to the Alt	ternative	
24	Dispute Resolution Office. The Office of General	Counsel has scored M	(UR	
25	5 6754 as low-rated matters. ² For the:reasons set for	6754 as low-rated matters. ² For the reasons set forth below, the Office of General Counsel		
26	6 recommends that the Commission	recommends that the Commission		
27	7 dismiss MUR 6754.			
	On September 1, 2014, the Act was transferred from Title 2 of the United States Code to new Title 52 of the United States Code.			
	The EPS rating information for MUR 6754 is as for 2013. Response Filed: October 17, 2013.	Complaint Filed: Septen	nber 12,	

Dismissal and Case Closure Under EPS – General Counsel's Report Page 2 MUR 6754

On September 12, 2013, AMVETS (American Veterans) (aka "AMVETS"), a Congressionally-chartered non-profit corporation³ that is tax-exempt pursuant to section 501(c)(19) of the Internal Revenue Code ("I.R.C."),4

³ See 36 U.S.C. § 22701 (AMVETS is a federally chartered corporation).

The Internal Revenue Service explains that I.R.C. § 501(c)(19) applies "only to veterans' groups and their related auxiliaries." See http://www.irs.gov/Charities-&-Non-Profits/Other-Non-Profits/Veterans-Organizations.

AMVETS has also filed a Complaint against Hart. Complaint ("Compl.") at 1-2. The

notice" that her contributions to ASAE's PAC, using AMVETS's corporate credit card and funds,

personal credit cards and that contributions from corporations could not be accepted. Id., see also

In response, Hart does not deny having made the contributions, but states that AMVETS

required her to use "the corporate credit card for any and all expenses related to [her] participation,

asserts that all of her expenses related to ASAE were approved in advance by AMVETS' executive

and representing of AMVETS . . . [including] ASAE." Hart Response (Resp.) at 1. Hart also

director and that, before her departure from AMVETS, all of her credit card statements were

reviewed on a regular basis and were found to be in order. ⁷ Id. at 1-2. She includes with her

, except for its claim that Hart had "actual"

14044564462

1

2

3

7

8.

Complaint is

9 violated federal law. Id. at 2. The Complaint includes "contribution forms" allegedly provided by 10 ASAE's PAC and signed by Hart, which state that credit card contributions should be made using

11

13 14

12

15 16

17

1.8 19

Response a letter of recommendation apparently written on her behalf by AMVETS National

Hart acknowledges that an issue was raised as to the use of the AMVETS credit card for personal expenses by herself as well as other AMVETS employees. Resp. at 1. She states that AMVETS subsequently changed its policy to

disallow the use of its credit cards for personal expenses. 1d.

Ex. B (includes ASAE's PAC contribution forms).

22

1	Executive Director James B. King, dated December 8, 2010, and further suggests that AMVETS	
2	may have filed the instant Complaint in connection with an unrelated employment dispute. Id. at 2.	
3	As for the contribution forms allegedly provided to her by ASAE, which state that corporation	
4	contributions are prohibited, Hart acknowledges that she may have failed to read the "fine print,"	
5	but asserts that she was "following the directives, policies and procedures" of AMVETS. Id. at 1.	
6	The Act and Commission regulations prohibit corporate contributions. 52 U.S.C.	
7	§ 30118(a) (formerly 2 U.S.C. § 441b(a)); see also 11 C.F.R. § 114.2(a). Similarly, officers and	
8	directors of corporations are prohibited from consenting to corporate contributions. 11 C.F.R.	
9	§ 114.2(e). Therefore, it appears that AMVETS and Hart, its National Finance Director, violated	
10	the Act and Commission regulations in connection with Hart's contributions to ASAE's PAC.	
11	However, it appears that \$750 of the \$1,500 in contributions at issue were made more than five	
12	years ago and, therefore, appear to fall outside of the five-year statute of limitations. See FEC v.	
13	Williams, 104 F.3d 237 (9th Cir. 1996), cert. denied, 522 U.S. 1015 (1997) (the general federal five	
14	year statute of limitations, 28 U.S.C. § 2462, applies to FEC civil enforcement actions that seek the	
15	imposition of civil penalties). The remaining amount at issue, \$750, is de minimis. Further, an	
16	investigation of the facts presented does not warrant the use of additional Enforcement resources.	
17		
18		
19	•	
20	The Office of General Counsel also recommends that the Commission exercise its prosecutorial	
21	discretion to dismiss MUR 6754. See Heckler v. Chaney, 470 U.S. 821 (1985). Additionally, the	

4. Close the file.

3. Approve the attached Factual and Legal Analysis and the appropriate letters; and

2. Dismiss MUR 6754, pursuant to the Commission's prosecutorial discretion;

BY:

Gregory R. Baker Deputy General Counsel

General Counsel

Self & Jordan

Assistant General Counsel Complaints Examination & Legal Administration

Ruth Heilizer

Attorney

Complaints Examination & Legal Administration